



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

But a still more interesting portion of this lecture, which seems to the reviewer of extreme eugenic value, deals with "The Influence of the Single Germ Plasm on the Race." Under this title, are described the family of Elizabeth Tuttle, certain of the first families of Virginia and of the Kentucky aristocracy, and finally, by way of contrast, the Jukes family, and the Ishmaelites.

All who are socially minded will sympathize with Professor Davenport and find deep significance in his exclamation: "Ah, that, in the hordes pressing at the gate at Ellis Island, we could distinguish the John Prestons from the Ben Ishmaels of the future!" (p. 308).

This, the final lecture of the volume, is concluded by a concise history of the eugenics movement in America.

ROBERT M. YERKES

HARVARD UNIVERSITY

Early Man in South America. By ALEŠ HRDLÍČKA (in collaboration with W. H. HOLMES, BAILEY WILLIS, FRED EUGENE WRIGHT, and CLARENCE N. FENNER). Bulletin 52. Bureau of American Ethnology. Washington: Government Printing office, 1912. 8vo, pp. xv+405.

For a long time past, a claim for man's great antiquity in South America has been made. The earlier evidence presented came from Brazil, the later from Argentina. That from Brazil, though presented on fair authority, has always been shaky and insecure; that from Argentina, on account of its mass, its diversity, its geographical range, its presentation by a man with reputation as a palaeontologist, has gained considerable consideration and has been accepted by some European authorities of weight. The man to whom we chiefly owe the Argentinian claim is Florentino Ameghino. He has proposed a classification of geological formations running back from modern time to the Upper Eocene, from which, at various levels, he has secured industrial vestiges, human remains, and the remains of man's precursors. As the result of finds already made, he has developed a scheme of human evolution which has been widely quoted. He claims that remains have been discovered, not only of several species of man besides *Homo sapiens*, but also of at least two genera of man's precursors. He has introduced the names *Homo Caputinclinatus*, *Homo sinemento*, *Homo pampaeus* (= *Prothomo*), *Diprothomo platensis*, *Tetraprothomo argentinus* for his new forms. By the term *Prothomo*, he means a form one step removed

from *Homo*; by *Diprothomo*, a form two steps back; by *Tetraprothomo*, one four steps back. These he claims to know. *Triprothomo* of course comes in between *Diprothomo* and *Tetraprothomo*, but has not yet been found. The theoretical importance of the occurrence of such a series of human and pre-human forms within a single area, a thing unparalleled elsewhere, could not be overemphasized. Such a wealth of forms in Argentina would speak loudly in favor of the South American continent as the original home of the *Hominidae*. This was clearly appreciated by Ameghino who, in recently announcing a sixth "hominien," says: "These six species of *hominiens*, cantoned in the same country, prove with all the eloquence of facts without appeal, that here exists the centre of origin, diversification, and dispersion of the human genus."

It is necessary then that these discoveries and claims receive critical examination. In 1910, Aleš Hrdlička visited Argentina and had the opportunity to study for himself the formations from which these remains were taken, the remains themselves, and the various industrial vestiges, which, found and described by Ameghino and others, had been considered ancient. Dr. Hrdlička was fortunate in having with him a competent geologist, Mr. Bailey Willis, who has had especial experience in the study of such loose, unconsolidated, easily shifted, aeolian, lacustrine, and fluvial deposits as are here in question. Hrdlička and Willis together visited the very sites from which the famous finds were taken, handled and studied the remains themselves, collected industrial vestiges for themselves *in situ*, reached their own conclusions. These are of the highest importance and significance. Let us look at them in detail. The industrial vestiges from Argentinan deposits are (a) baked earth or *tierra cocida*, (b) scoriae, (c) used or worked stones, (d) used or worked bones. Our authors decide that the *tierra cocida* and the scoriae are due to purely natural causes, not to fires artificially produced by man. The used or worked stones and bones are found in situations which suggest no great antiquity and comparison of them with objects of relatively recent Indian fabrication shows identity with them; there are, indeed, some local differences in these finds, but these suggest at most mere tribal differences between the makers; nothing was found to indicate a marked difference in culture, or a serious antiquity. Examination of the localities, where the famous remains were found leaves strong doubt of the great age of any of Ameghino's species of *Homo*. The specimens themselves, when critically examined, do not warrant the establishment of new species for any of them. All are plainly *Homo*—*Homo sapiens*—and *Homo sapiens* of a clearly marked South American Indian type.

One can but be convinced of this the moment that careful measurements are made of the specimens and an exact and rigid comparison established between them and modern Indian remains. As to the precursors—*Diprothomo* and *Tetraprothomo*—the case is startling. The piece upon which the genus *Diprothomo* is founded is a skull fragment. Ameghino apparently placed it for study upon any flat supporting surface; from it he made a full description of a “precursor” far lower than any human type now known, lower than *Pithecanthropus* itself. Hrdlička says that when he really saw and handled the specimen his “first impression amounted to incredulity as to its being the relic in question.” It is no precursor; when properly oriented and carefully compared with human skulls, it is plainly human. Not only so but it is a fragment of the skull of “a well developed and physically modern-like human individual.” It presents some peculiarities but they are of secondary importance and do not even warrant the separation of the skull from probable reference to an American Indian. As to *Tetraprothomo*, this precursorial genus of Ameghino is based upon two bones found at Monte Hermoso—an atlas and a femur. If the two bones come from a single individual it would indeed be different from *Homo sapiens*. The atlas presents some actually striking features. Hrdlička carefully compares it with a series of Indian atlases. He decides that it is human, modern, from a short and probably thickset man. Were similar atlases found in number, they might perhaps suggest a distinct human variety; the simple specimen does not warrant even such an assumption. The femur, referred by Ameghino to *Tetraprothomo*, proves to be that of a carnivore, probably a cat form, and has no “hominien” importance.

As is seen, Hrdlička's book is one of destructive criticism. It is always an unpleasant task to tear down what another has reared in good faith; it is seldom done in entire kindness and courtesy. Hrdlička shows both qualities but he has done his work thoroughly. It is possible that from our brief notice one might think our author stands alone in his work of criticism, or that he has neglected the bibliography of his subject. Far from it; he is by no means the only opponent of Ameghino's views and in his discussion he makes a full presentation of the literature of the subject as he takes up point after point. But Hrdlička is actually the only worker, who has taken up *all the evidence* in detail, subjected it to exhaustive critical treatment, and reached definite conclusions.

FREDERICK STARR

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO